91-04998/

Manitoba

Annual Report 1988 - 89

The Clean Environment Commission

Minister of
Environment

Legislative Building
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA
R3C 0V8

His Honour
The Honourable George Johnson
Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba
Room 235 Legislative Building
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Your Honour:

The undersigned has the honour to present the Annual Report of The Clean Environment Commission detailing its activities for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1989.

Yours sincerely,

J. Glen Cummings
Minister of Environment

Manitoba

Clean Environment Commission

Office of the Chairperson

Towne Square P. O.
Box 21420
284 Reimer Avenue
Steinbach, Manitoba, CANADA
R0A 2T3

(204) 326-2395 (Office)
(204) 326-2472 (Fax)

The Honourable J. Glen Cummings
Minister of Environment
Room 344 Legislative Building
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Dear Mr. Cummings:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 6(10) of The Environment Act I am pleased to submit to you the Commission's annual report for the year ending March 31, 1989.

This was the first year of operation under The Environment Act, which was proclaimed in force March 31, 1988.

Submitted on behalf of the Commission.

O. Stanley Eagleton
Chairperson

Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE

The Clean Environment Commission 3

Background and Responsibilities 5

Hearings 9

- Water Pollution Control 9
- Air Pollution Control 12
- Mining Operations 15
- Other Hearings 18

Effectiveness of Hearings 21

State of the Environment 22

List of Public Hearings 24

THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

During the 1988-89 year, Commission membership consisted of the following citizen appointees and full-time chairperson, working with the support of a staff of three. The Minister responsible for the Clean Environment Act for the period under review was the Honourable Ed Connery, Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.

Members of the Commission were:

Mr. Stan Eagleton, Civil servant, Winnipeg, Chairperson
*Mrs. Mamie Hendren, Hospital employee, Thompson, Commissioner
*Mrs. Agathe LaCroix, Legal secretary, Winnipeg, Commissioner
*Mr. George Luther, Retired agricultural research worker, Winnipeg Commissioner
Mrs. Betty Pawlicki, Real estate agent, Winnipeg, Commissioner
Dr. Barrie Webster, University professor, Vice-Chairperson (part year)

*Commissioner's appointments recinded October 24, 1988

Members of the Commission appointed October 24, 1988 for a term of three years and thereafter until their successors are appointed were:

Mr. Stan Eagleton, Civil servant, Winnipeg, Chairperson
Mr. Arnie Barr, Retired provincial civil servant, Portage la Prairie
Mr. Maurice Blanchard, Commercial fisherman, Portage la Prairie
Ms. Linda Ericsson, Newspaper employee, Winnipeg
Mr. Len Flett, Northern stores employee, Winnipeg
Mr. Ed Gramiak, Building contractor, Winnipeg
Ms. Elizabeth Pawlicki, Real estate agent, Winnipeg
Ms. Donna Plant, Community worker, Winnipeg
Ms. Joan Vestby, Insurance agent, Swan River
Dr. Barrie Webster, University professor, Winnipeg

STAFF

Executive Secretary.....Mr. Bob Stewart
Technical Adviser.....Mr. Jim Warrener
Administration Secretary.....Ms. Regine Kublanski

BACKGROUND AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Manitoba Environment Act, assented to July 17, 1987, was proclaimed on March 31, 1988 replacing the Clean Environment Act which had been Manitoba's primary piece of environmental legislation for approximately two decades, undergoing a number of major and minor revisions and amendments during this period of time.

This new Act broadened the scope of environmental interest and regulation to a significant degree. Environmental considerations for licencing under the Act are no longer confined to operations involving the emission of point source contaminants. For example, public works such as highway and dam construction projects now must be registered for environmental licencing and require a broad range of environmental impact assessment. Socio-economic considerations and impacts arising from environmental effects are also included within the framework of considerations defined in the Act.

This broadening of the scope of the Act leads to the environmental licencing of a new spectrum of developments having environmental impact potential. Such regulation is in keeping with the emergence of new perspectives on the need to protect and improve our environment in the face of recent and disturbing knowledge of current wide-spread environmental degradation on a global scale. Serious and pervasive problems threaten to change the global environment in a drastic manner.

The new Act puts Manitoba in the forefront of environmental management and regulation and should provide a foundation for environmental protection and sustainable development into the next century.

The function of the Clean Environment Commission has changed with the Act. Strictly speaking, the Commission may no longer be considered a quasi-judicial body regulating point source environmental pollution. The Commission now functions as the vehicle for public participation in environmental decision making at the request of the Environment Minister when a legitimate public interest in the licencing of a proposal under the Environment Act has been identified. When such an interest has been registered the Commission may be asked to hold hearings and - at the conclusion of such hearings and after consideration of all evidence and argument - the Commission must report to the Minister and/or the department on the outcome of the hearings with its recommendations on the matter of licencing under consideration.

Under the new Act, the Commission retains its former general investigatory mandate, either on its own volition or at the request of the Environment Minister, and its former duties under an abatement project. As well, the Commission may be requested to play a mediation role in environmental disputes, where such mediation may be perceived to be beneficial to a possible solution of an environmental conflict or controversy.

Operating under the former Clean Environment Act, the Environment Department made reports to the Clean Environment Commission on every operation or proposal which was registered by the Department for licencing by the Commission. These reports included what amounted to an environmental impact assessment as well as recommendations for the terms and conditions of the licence.

Frequently, this Departmental report contained the only formal environmental impact assessment that was made, as the proponent was not required to submit such a document, although proposals for large

undertakings - such as new or expanded mining operations, for example - usually included an environmental impact assessment on the proposed operation that was detailed and comprehensive in scope.

The new Environment Act and Regulations set out three formally designated classes of development proposals, each of which may require the proponent to prepare an environmental impact assessment of the proposal to the satisfaction of the Departmental licencing "director" who may require the proponent to undertake additional studies or the compilation of such additional information as may be considered to be necessary.

Guidelines and instructions for the necessary environmental impact assessments are provided by the Department. Part of the environmental impact assessment process is the requirement that a copy of the proposal be filed with the Interdepartmental Planning Board and that a copy also be circulated to such other departments as may be affected by the development for their review and comment. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee of appropriate departmental officials may be appointed to jointly consider and comment on the proposal in order to assist the deliberations of the Interdepartmental Planning Board.

The consideration and preparation of an adequate environmental impact assessment is an essential preliminary requirement preceding any subsequent judgment and recommendations for licencing considerations. The procedures outlined in the Act should provide the vehicle for the preparation of satisfactory environmental impact assessment reports and bring into play the important professional expertise contained within the professional ranks of the staff of government departments.

The Act also assures that the public are kept informed by means of a Public Registry system. A summary of the proposal is filed in public registries located throughout the Province. Advertisements concerning the

proposals are also placed in local newspapers. Such advertisements, and the placement of the proposal and environmental assessment in the Registry, provide assurance that the public have opportunity to express comments, concerns, or objections. It is these expressions of concern which stimulate a request by the Environment Minister for a Clean Environment Commission hearing.

HEARINGS

During the fiscal year 1988/89 the Commission held a total of ten hearings. Nine of the hearings resulted from representations received by the Environment Department about proposed projects and current operations while one hearing was held in connection with The Surface Water Quality Objectives and Classification Program. The public hearings took place in twelve locations throughout Manitoba. All of the hearings were advertised in local newspapers in order to assure that concerned and interested members of the public could participate in the consideration of the proposals under review.

The following segments provide brief descriptions of the operations reviewed by the Commission during this period. Copies of the Commission's reports on these hearings are available.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Three hearings were held in connection with the control of water pollution. Of these, two dealt with Hutterite Colony wastewater lagoons and one with a municipal treatment facility.

Hutterite Colony Farm Wastewater Facilities

The Environment Department continued to receive registrations of wastewater treatment proposals by Hutterite Colony farms for their wastewater facilities. In 1988, following registration for licencing, two colony farms proposals, Bon Homme Colony and Upland Colony, were referred to the Commission for hearings because of public interest and concern.

Bon Homme Colony, located in the Rural Municipality of Westbourne proposed a lagoon to treat domestic wastewater from a projected colony size of 120 people. As a result of objections to the proposal a hearing was originally scheduled for March 29, 1988 in Westbourne; however, because of the objections filed against the proposal, the colony withdrew its original proposal and then revised and resubmitted it.

The original proposal dealt with sewage lagoon effluent discharge to Squirrel Creek. The new proposal included a requirement to apply effluent to agricultural land under the control of the Colony. The resubmitted proposal could not be dealt with prior to the proclamation of the new Environment Act and consequently the initially planned hearing was cancelled.

On April 29, 1988 the Clean Environment Commission received a request from the Deputy Minister of the Environment Department for a new hearing of the revised proposal, under the new Environment Act. The hearing was held in Westbourne.

Some of the original complaints from the citizens had been addressed through the modification of the proposal; however, remaining concerns were expressed about the quality and quantity of the water to be discharged into the Squirrel and Pine Creeks and the Whitemud River.

The Commission's report following the hearing presented recommendations relative to effluent disposal as well as monitoring considerations that would safeguard both the receiving stream and the agricultural land to which effluent may be applied.

Upland Colony Farms submitted a proposal for the construction of a wastewater treatment lagoon to be located in the Rural Municipality of Minto. This proposal was also revised and resubmitted under the new Environment Act.

The modified proposal called for discharge of lagoon effluent to a drainage ditch which empties into Stoney Creek. Concerns were raised about the potential degradation of the water quality of the creek which is a habitat for a population of brook trout and is also utilized as a water source for downstream agricultural operations.

Recommendations with regard to the licencing of these facilities were made by the Commission in reports submitted by the Commission following consideration of evidence and argument received at the hearings. Limits and conditions recommended would allow effluent to be discharged to the Creek without impairing the uses of the Creek.

Village of Shoal Lake Wastewater Lagoon

A hearing was held by the Commission in the Village of Shoal Lake to address concerns in connection with a proposed lagoon expansion. This expansion was proposed to cope with a lack of adequate storage capacity.

Concerns from the public focused primarily on the discharge of treated wastewater from the lagoon to Shoal Lake and the potential for further degradation of the water quality of the lake. Some alternative discharge routes were also outlined for discussion and consideration.

In its report, the Commission recommended that a licence be granted to expand the lagoon system, as this would result in a better quality effluent, and that the village further investigate a discharge route alternative that would prevent any deterioration in the water quality of Shoal Lake.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Three hearings were held in connection with the control of emissions to the atmosphere of noise, odor or other specific air borne contaminants. Of these, two involved existing food processing industries, while the third considered a proposed metal casting facility.

Precise-To-Form Castings Inc., - Winnipeg

Precise-To-Form Castings Inc. registered a proposal for the construction of a foundry operation in a new industrial subdivision in the west Fort Garry Industrial Park. The proposed plant was designed to produce high quality ferrous and aluminum castings with the production process having the potential to emit small amounts of hydrochloric acid and sodium hydroxide fumes and particulates to the atmosphere.

There are 3 major housing subdivisions in relatively close proximity to the industry. Interest was high due to the proximity of the industry to the residential subdivision and approximately one hundred people attended the hearing. Many voiced concerns about the gaseous emissions as well as air borne particulates which could potentially be produced by the casting process.

In its report, the Commission made recommendations for licencing which would regulate emissions as well as recommendations for the monitoring of emissions following the commencement of plant operations.

McCain Foods Ltd., - Portage la Prairie

The McCain Foods Ltd. potato processing plant operates in an industrial park in the northeast section of the City of Portage la Prairie.

The plant emits noise and odors. Odors originate from the potato chip frying operation as well as from the wastewater treatment facility. Cooling equipment located both on the roof and on rail cars are the principal noise sources.

A nearby residential subdivision known as Peony Farms is located immediately north of the McCain operation in the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie. Residents of this subdivision have complained of odors and noise from the plant since plant start-up.

Clean Environment Commission hearings had been held in the past to address the problem of odors and noise being emitted from the plant and the concerns of the residents related to these emissions. Commission recommendations, following previous hearings, related to possible additional control of the emissions of odors and noise. One of the recommendations was that the Company should further research new technology and developments which might achieve the Provincial objective levels for emissions of odor and noise.

The current hearing, held in Portage la Prairie on June 23, 1988, was a continuation of a previous hearing held in Portage la Prairie in December, 1987, which was adjourned at the request of McCain Foods Ltd. to allow additional time to review recent monitoring data reported by the Environment Department at that hearing. The Company also requested additional time to consider and report on further feasible plant improvements in the light of the monitoring data and the recommendations made by the Environment Department officials for the imposition of new noise and odor limits. The planned reconvention of the hearing was delayed by the proclamation of the Environment Act which necessitated a request by the Department for the Commission to continue the hearing. This request was received by the Commission on April 29, 1988.

At all hearings there was repeated questioning of the acceptability of locating an industrial area of the City of Portage la Prairie immediately adjacent to a residential area established by other municipal government, namely the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie. This situation resulted in an industry with a potential for high odor and noise emissions being located at the boundry of an industrial area, adjacent to a residential area. In this regard, it was encouraging to note that the City of Portage la Prairie had recently appointed a task force to consider the establishment of a planning district which would take into consideration rural development in the surrounding municipalities. A joint planning board should prevent such conflicting development from occurring in the future.

At the reconvened hearing, the most recent results of monitoring by the Environment Department and the mitigative measures undertaken by the Company were presented. Presentations by representatives of the City of Portage la Prairie and Environment Department officials were also received and reviewed.

Following the hearing the Commission made its report, including recommendations with regard to the regulation of noise and odor levels in a new licence. As the operation was not able to meet odor and noise limits that are normally considered acceptable in a residential area, it was recommended that the Applicant continue studies into methods of further reducing noise and odors, such studies to be reported to the Department within a reasonable time frame.

Burns Rendering Plant - Brandon

This plant was constructed in 1965 and almost from the outset there have been complaints about the odor and noise associated with the rendering operation.

In response to complaints received by the Environment Department, the Clean Environment Commission was requested to review the licence regulating emissions from the plant.

The Commission concluded that a serious problem associated with the Brandon rendering plant currently exists and if the plant was to remain in operation at the current site a further reduction in odor emissions would be required. The Commission recommended the imposition of progressively lower limits for odor emissions and that a further licence review at a public hearing should be undertaken on or about December 31, 1990.

The Commission also recommended that the City of Brandon consider the instigation of an abatement project for the relocation of the plant to effect a permanent solution to this continuing problem.

NOTE: Since the hearing and the subsequent issuance of a new licence by the Environment Department, this rendering plant has been closed.

MINING OPERATIONS

Canamax Resources Inc., - Russell

Canamax Resources Inc. proposed development of a potash mine and mill in the Rural Municipality of Russell. The Commission was requested to prepare a preliminary report to the Environment Minister by December 15, 1988. Hearings were held in Russell on October 25, 1988 and a preliminary report was made in mid December. This preliminary report was followed by a full report in February, 1989.

Section 13 of the Environment Act provides for a licence to be issued in stages. A stage 1 Licence, giving approval in principle, had been issued for the development by the Environment Department in September of 1988. The Clean Environment Commission was requested to hold hearings to develop recommendations for the stage 2, Development and Construction, licence. The principal concern associated with a potash mine project is the handling, storage and disposal of both brine and saline mine and mill tailings. The proposal called for the collection of brine from the tailings pond and disposal of excess brine to a deep underground formation.

Proven technology for the management of such waste had been employed at most of the Saskatchewan potash mines and was available for review. The experience and information gained from other similar facilities along with evidence collected at the hearings were of considerable value in the development of licencing recommendations.

The Commission's report provided recommendations for the construction of safe handling and storage for mill tailings and brine. Recommendations were made concerning the need to examine alternative tailings management and disposal methods and post management and rehabilitation plans. Recommendations were also made concerning stage 3 licencing considerations.

Pioneer Metals - Puffy Lake Gold Mine

On June 3, 1988 the Commission submitted its report to the Environment Minister on a hearing held on March 22, 1988 under the former Clean Environment Act, to consider the licencing of the new Puffy Lake Gold Mine developed by Pioneer Metals near the community of Sherridon. The milling and gold extraction involved a cyanide process, with treatment to

remove the cyanide from the effluent utilizing hydrogen peroxide. Mill tailings and mine wastewater were to be discharged to a No Name Lake and thence to the Burntwood River drainage basin.

Under the procedures allowed under the former Clean Environment Act, the proposal, registered in October of 1986, was brought into production in December, 1987. However, because of concerns registered by citizens of the Sherridon area and the Sherridon Community Council, the Commission was asked to hold a hearing following the filing of a report on the emissions and environmental impact of the operation by the Environment Department on January 21, 1988. The hearing was held in Sherridon on March 22, 1988.

At the hearing, citizens registered concern about serious tailings area pollution caused by unsatisfactory conditions of containment and treatment following the closure of a former major base metal mining operation in the Sherridon area. Leachate from the abandoned tailings containment area had seriously degraded the quality of a nearby lake. Fears were expressed that similar conditions might result from the current proposal.

Studies, which were tabled at the hearing, demonstrated that the Puffy Lake Mine wastes do not have potential for acid generation. Following the hearing the Company filed with the Commission further proposals for the management of the tailings residue pond and effluent.

The Commission's report recommended limits on effluent discharges along with terms and conditions designed to protect the quality of downstream receiving waters from unacceptable deterioration.

NOTE: Following a relatively short production period, this mining operation has been closed.

OTHER HEARINGS

Netley Creek Golf Course

In accordance with the Environment Act, new golf course developments are required to be registered. Construction should not take place before an environmental licence is issued.

Work on the Netley Creek Golf Course had already commenced prior to the registration of this proposal under the new Act; however, construction was halted by the Environment Department pending a hearing by the Clean Environment Commission to hear the concerns registered by many local farmers.

Objections to the development centered around the use of agriculturally zoned land for a recreational development because of the fear that golf course users would likely, sooner or later, object to farm operations of adjacent farmers, most of whom were involved in livestock operations. There were also long-standing concerns about the adverse effects of the encroachment of non-farm developments into farming areas. History has demonstrated that the development of residential or recreational developments in a farming area frequently results in friction between agricultural operations and other developments, particularly as a result of odors associated with livestock operations.

The Commission concluded that the golf course would not create any significant impact to the environment in the conventional sense of physical environmental degradation including impacts on the water quality of Netley Creek. However, the concerns voiced by the farmers were understood and considered to be legitimate. The Commission noted that the developer and the municipal representative had stated that there would be no attempt to interfere with or restrict the operations of surrounding livestock farm activities.

In its report, the Commission recommended that a licence be issued giving due consideration to the environmental effects and the investment already made by the developer, in good faith, having obtained all necessary approvals for his proposals before commencing construction prior to the proclamation of the Environment Act. The Commission also noted that the recommendation for the licencing of this operation should not be taken as a precedent for future golf course development proposals which may be referred to the Commission for licencing recommendations under similar farming area conditions, e.g. proximity of livestock operations.

Shell Prairie Inn and Gas Station

Prairie Shell Inn and Gas Station, located in the Parish of High Bluff east of Portage la Prairie had been instructed by the Environment Department to replace the existing septic tank and soil absorption sewage disposal system. With the abandonment of the existing septic tank and field, liquid wastes were being removed to ponds located at a waste disposal ground north of Poplar Point.

The Commission was requested to hold a hearing to consider the replacement of the system with a proposed wastewater stabilization pond. Effluent from the pond would be utilized to irrigate nearby agricultural crop land under the control of the proponent. The main concern with theoperation of the facility was the potential for objectionable odors, soil degradation from the minerals in the wastewater, and possible contamination of a nearby groundwater aquifer. Presentations were received from local residents and the Departments of Environment and Agriculture.

The Commission recommended that a licence be issued with limits, terms and conditions to ensure safe operation of the lagoon, and the long term protection of soil quality.

Clearwater Lake Watershed Basin

The Clean Environment Commission was requested to conduct public hearings to ensure that there was full public participation and discussion of a proposal developed by the Environment Department to designate Clearwater Lake a "high quality" water body under the Manitoba Water Quality Objectives Program. Implementation of the proposal would mean that measurable degradation of water quality should not occur as a result of future human activity.

The hearing, held in The Pas on November 7, 1988 was well attended by a variety of interest groups including citizens of the area, cottage owners and commercial operators on Clearwater Lake, Indian band representatives, environmental organizations and mining company representatives. Most spoke strongly in favour of the proposed designation and none opposed the proposal.

Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing the Commission concluded that the proposal to classify Clearwater Lake as a "high quality" water body meets the requirements of the Manitoba Surface Water Quality Objectives Document. The Commission therefore recommended that the Clearwater Lake Watershed Region be classified as "high quality", in accordance with the Manitoba Surface Water Quality Objectives and Watershed Classification Program.

* *

NOTE: Following each of the foregoing hearings, reports with recommendations for licencing were proposed by the Commission and submitted to the Environment Department. Copies of these reports are available from the Commission on request.

EFFECTIVENESS OF HEARINGS

With the exception of the review of the licence of the Burns Rendering Plant at Brandon, the Commission's recommendations were followed by the Environment Department on almost all material points in the issuance of Environmental Licences. In the case of the Burns Rendering Plant Licence, odor limits and time frames for compliance that the Commission had recommended were relaxed by the Environment Department to a significant degree because the Department was of the opinion that the Commission's recommendations on odor regulation were impractically restrictive.

It is noteworthy that none of the licences issued by the Environment Department, following hearings and Commission reports, were appealed. This continues the pattern established previously over many years that the Commission's hearing process can and frequently does lead to the issuance of licences that are accepted as reasonable and appropriate by both industry and citizens. However, in making this observation, the Commission is aware that when important and highly controversial issues that have a wide ranging impact are involved, appeals by representatives of some, or sometimes by all sides of the issue, are often inevitable.

STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Under the terms of the former Clean Environment Act, it was the Commission's responsibility to report annually on the "state of the environment". With its small staff, which was kept busy by environmental hearings and licencing responsibilities, the Clean Environment Commission was never able to do justice to the fulfillment of this responsibility, especially in relation to the rapidly increasing expectations of citizens progressively both more concerned and better informed about the environment over the period of the last three decades, since the passage of Manitoba's first modern environmental legislation.

The Commission was forced to limit itself essentially to rather general observations or to specific local matters about which it was knowledgeable by virtue of its hearings. The Commission simply did not have either the resources to develop a proper data base or the analytic capability for the type of "state of the environment" comparative reporting that has evolved and is expected by today's environmentally sophisticated and knowledgeable citizens. For several years past, the Commission has urged that this responsibility be passed to the Environment Department which is equipped with the necessary resources to turn out a product that will meet expectations.

Under the new Environment Act, the Environment Minister is required to cause to be prepared a "State of the Environment Report" by the spring of 1991 and at least every two years, thereafter, containing the following information:

(a) description of Manitoba's environmental quality, and activities related to present environmental issues;

(b) future environmental issues, projected trends and environmental management activities.

This is both an ambitious and arduous undertaking but it's fulfillment will serve to keep Manitoba's citizens on top of past and present environmental developments and will provide the ability to assess progress or slippage in the protection and enhancement of the environment. The Commission wishes the Environment Department well in this difficult endeavor and will look forward with anticipation to the production of this valuable assessment tool.

PUBLIC HEARINGS 1988/89

Hearing Number	Date	Subject	Location
H-01-88/89	88/06/16	Bon Homme Colony Farms Ltd. concerning the construction of a wastewater collection system and a wastewater treatment lagoon located on SE 1/4 Section 1-13-11 WPM and with discharge of treated effluent onto agricultural land located on NE 1/4 Section 1-13-11 WPM	Westbourne
H-02-88/89	88/06/21	Upland Colony Farms Ltd. concerning the construction and operation of a wastewater collection system and a wastewater treatment lagoon located in the NW 1/4 of Section 13-16-17W in the Rural Municipality of Minto with discharge of effluent to a coulee emptying into Stony Creek	Minnedosa
H-03-88/89	88/06/23	McCain Foods Limited concerning the operation of a potato processing plant located on or near Lot One, on Block One of part of Parish Lots Sixty Eight and Sixty Nine of the Parish of Portage la Prairie	Portage la Prairie
H-04-88/89	88/06/27	Precise-To-Form Castings Inc. concerning the operation of a precision investment casting foundry at or near 19 Henlow Bay in the City of Winnipeg	Winnipeg
H-05-88/89	88/09/07	Burns Meats concerning the operation of a rendering plant located on Lot 10/42, Plan 1134 (NE 1/4 34-10-19W) Brandon	Brandon
H-06-88/89	88/09/13	Netley Creek Golf Course concerning the construction and operation of an 18 hole golf course on the NE 1/4 of Section 28, Township 15, Range 4 EPM in the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews	Petersfield

PUBLIC HEARINGS 1988/89

Hearing Number	Date	Subject	Location
H-07-88/89	88/10/04	The Village of Shoal Lake concerning the operation of a wastewater treatment lagoon located in Section 4, Township 17, Range 23 WPM in the Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake servicing the Village of Shoal Lake and with the discharge of treated effluent to the waters of Shoal Lake	Shoal Lake
H-08-88/89 H-09-88/89	88/10/25 88/10/27 88/10/28	Canamax Resources Inc. (Manitoba Potash Project) concerning the development and construction of a postash mine and milling facility in the Rural Municipality of Russell	Russell Winnipeg
H-10-88/89	88/11/07	Clearwater Lake concerning the proposed designation of Clearwater Lake as a "high quality" water body under the Manitoba Surface Water Quality Objectives	The Pas
H-11-88/89	89/01/05	Shell Canada Products Limited (Shell Prairie Inn) concerning the operation of a wastewater collection system; the construction and operation of a wastewater treatment lagoon located on River Lot 25, Parish of High Bluff in the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie; and the operation of an effluent irrigation system with discharge of the treated effluent onto land owned by the Applicant	Portage la Prairie